



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/892,385

06/26/2001

Randy Prager

1584/65397

2918

23432

7590

08/26/2005

COOPER & DUNHAM, LLP
1185 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 10036

EXAMINER

LU, KUEN S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2167

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/892,385

Applicant(s)

PRAGER ET AL.

Examiner

Kuen S. Lu

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 2-20 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendments

1. The Action is responsive to the Applicant's Amendments, filed on December 22, 2004.
2. Regarding the Applicant's amendments filed on filed on December 22, 2004, the following new issues were raised which would require further consideration and/or new search. Please see MPEP 706.07(b).

Claim 1 was amended to:

1. (currently amended) A method of for operating a desktop system comprising:
creating document object models comprising selected information from and about
information assets of diverse types, created by diverse software, said document object
models having a consistent structure;
displaying browse cards related to respective ones of the information assets in a time-
ordered stream, together with glance views related to the document object models of
the respective displayed documents, said glance views being displayed in response to
passing a cursor over respective ones of the browse cards, wherein each browse card
includes a corresponding set of command buttons specific to the information asset
associated with the browse card.
3. As to Applicant's arguments filed on December 22, 2004 with respect to claim 1 have
been considered but are moot on new ground(s) of rejection.
4. Newly submitted claims 2-20 are directed to an invention that is independent or
distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:

Original claim 1 is drawn to operating a desktop system (creating document object models and displaying browse cards) and classified in class 715/526.

Newly added claims 2-20 are drawn to managing desktop information system (searching and retrieving information) and classified in class 707/3.

Since the Applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 2-20 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

5. The Applicant's amendment to claim 1 for removing the term "essentially" is accepted. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection to the claim under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 is hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. (U.S. Patent 5,299,122, hereafter "Wang") in view of Tabb (U.S. Patent 5,603,025), and further in view of Nielsen (U.S. Patent 5,937,417).

As per Claim 1, Wang teaches "creating document object models comprising selected information from and about information assets of diverse types, created by diverse software, said document object models having a consistent structure" (See Fig. 2 and col. 3, line 7- col. 4, line 46, and col. 1, lines 47-67 where document model is created, with various types of objects input and stored with each document, whose designs are mapped to DIA library service architecture of consistent data structure is equivalent to the Applicant's creating document object models comprising selected information from and about information assets of diverse types, created by diverse software, said document object models having a consistent structure).

Wang does not specifically teach "displaying browse cards related to respective ones of the information assets in a time-ordered stream, together with glance views related to the document object models of the respective displayed documents", "wherein each browse card includes a corresponding set of command buttons specific to the information asset associated with the browse card".

However, Tabb teaches "displaying browse cards related to respective ones of the information assets in a time-ordered stream, together with glance views related to the document object models of the respective displayed documents", "wherein each browse

card includes a corresponding set of command buttons specific to the information asset associated with the browse card" (See Figs. 3A-3I, col. 12, lines 18 – col. 13, line 24, col. 23, lines 35-39 where browser icons are displayed and each serves as command for performing task as specified in the name of the icon or retrieving and displaying a web page while the display of document is designed in timely fashion).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine the teaching of Tabb with Wang reference by utilizing the display of multiple displaying objects for Wang's plural representation of document model objects because both references are directed document creation, and by doing so the need for switching from screen to screen for viewing the displaying objects, such as reports, would be have been avoided.

Note the combined teaching of Wang and Tabb references does not specifically teach the "glance views are "being displayed in response to passing a cursor over respective ones of the browse cards".

However, Nielsen teaches "cursor over" by moving cursor over a displaying object, without clicking the object, to initiate next level of display in more detailed fashion at Fig. 4 and col. 4, lines 44-55.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine the teaching of Nielsen with the Tabb and Wang references because the references are directed to document creation and display, and the further combined teaching would have enabled user to view multiple

displaying objects simultaneously more conveniently by simply moving the cursor around without the need of additional operation of mouse click.

8. The prior art made of record

G. U.S. Patent No. 5,299,122

H. U.S. Patent No. 5,603,025

I. U.S. Patent No. 5,937,417

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A. U.S. Patent No. 5542086

B. U.S. Patent No. 5784620

C. U.S. Patent No. 4586035

D. U.S. Patent No. 6006227

E. U.S. Patent No. 6243724

F. U.S. Patent No. 5586237

Conclusions

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuen S. Lu whose telephone number is 571-272-4114. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM, Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kuen S. Lu


Patent Examiner

August 17, 2005



Mohammad Ali

Primary Examiner

August 17, 2005